

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILI	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,848	07/24/2003		Dan Burris	005127.00309	8940
22909	7590	08/29/2005		EXAMINER	
BANNER &		•	PATTERSON, MARIE D		
1001 G STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	3728	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\boldsymbol{\omega}$				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers	10/625,848	BURRIS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
71 4441 010 8477 444	Marie Patterson	3728				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 A</u>	ugust 2005.					
	s action is non-final.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under the	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8,10-14,27-34 and 41-49 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) 49 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8,10-14,27-34 and 41-48 is/are rejection is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	cepted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	. 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	_	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/625,848 Page 2

Art Unit: 3728

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 5-8, 10, 12-14, 27, 30-34, 41, 43, and 45-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zaino (4447967).

Zaino shows a shoe comprising an upper formed from a substrate comprising a textile material formed from a pourality of filaments or fibers (fabric sock, it is noted that according to Merrian Webster Online dictionary the term "fabric" is defined as "cloth" and "cloth" is defined as "a pliable material made usually by weaving, felting, or knitting natural or synthetic fibers and filaments") and a web layer with apertures (formed by elements 9-14) which is injection molded onto the substrate layer and the polymer material inherently extends around the plurlaity of filaments or fibers to secure the web layer (Zaino states "the plastic material sets on the sock and combines securely therewith" (column 1 lines 60-65) and "The plastic structure is indissolubly bonded to the vamp or sock" (column 2 lines 36-40)). During the injection molding process described by Zaino the plastic polymeric material would inherently extends around the plurlaity of filaments or fibers to secure the web layer.

In reference to claims 11-13, 31, 32, and 46-48, a comparison of the recited process with the prior art processes does NOT serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product. In re Fessman, 489 F2d 742, 180 U.S.P.Q. 324 (CCPA)

Application/Control Number: 10/625,848 Page 3

Art Unit: 3728

1974). Whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made is patentable. In re Klug, 333 F2d 905, 142 U.S.P.Q. 161 (CCPA 1964). In an ex parte case, product-by-process claims are not construed as being limited to the product formed by the specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15, see footnote 3 (CCPA 1976).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 2, 11, 29, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaino.
- 3. Zaino as discussed above shows a shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact material for the substrate and the exact polymeric material. Zaino suggests the use of different materials (column 2 lines 40-44). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a non woven sock fabric and polyurethane, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.
- 4. Claims 3, 4, 28, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaino in view of Shiomura (4785558) or Bartels (4232458).

Art Unit: 3728

Zaino shows a shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact substrate. Shiomura or Bartels teaches the use of a substrate which comprises two layers which are interconnected by fibers as a material for uppers of footwear. It would have been obvious to use a layered substrate as taught by either Shiomura or Bartels for the substrate in the shoe of Zaino to increase fit and comfort.

5. Claims 8, 10, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zaino in view of Sass (3650051).

Zaino shows a shoe substantially as claimed except for ridges. Zaino suggests different vamp shapes (column 2 lines 40-44). Sass teaches providing ridges (26) on a lateral portion of a shoe. It would have been obvious to provide ridges as taught by Sass on the lateral portion of an upper in the shoe of Zaino to allow the shoe to be used for kicking a ball and to control the ball.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 49 is allowed.

Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 1. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Other useful information can be obtained at the PTO Home Page at www.uspto.gov.

In order to avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Center at (572)272-8300

Application/Control Number: 10/625,848

Art Unit: 3728

Page 5

(FORMAL FAXES ONLY). Please identify Examiner <u>Marie Patterson</u> of Art Unit <u>3728</u> at the top of your cover sheet.

Any inquiry concerning the MERITS of this examination from the examiner should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4559. The examiner can normally be reached from 6AM - 4PM Mon-Wed.

Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728